DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 298 102 SP 030 513

TITLE Report to the Legislature on Development of Teacher Evaluation Models. (Chapter 73, Laws of 1986).
INSTITUTION Washington Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Olympia.
PUB DATE Jan 88
NOTE 44p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Demonstration Programs; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Methods; Field Tests; Minimum Competency Testing; *Program Development; Program Evaluation; *State Standards; *Teacher Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS *Washington

ABSTRACT

This report from the State Superintendent of Public Instruction responds to a directive from the Washington State Legislature to provide information on the progress of the development and field testing of minimum procedural standards and model evaluation programs for teachers. It contains a draft of the proposed minimum procedural standards for evaluation as well as information regarding the field testing and development of model evaluation programs. There were four directives: (1) propose minimum procedural standards for field tests of evaluation programs; (2) develop or purchase and conduct field tests of model evaluation programs in local districts; (3) consult with educators, parents, and the business community in considering a variety of programs; and (4) adopt state procedural standards and select from one to five model evaluation programs to be used in conducting evaluations. Action taken on each directive is reported, and recommendations are made for the legislature. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. C. Rutherford

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SPI

DR. FRANK B. BROUILLET — Superintendent of Public Instruction

January 1, 1988

TO: Members of the Washington State Legislature

FROM: Dr. Frank B. Brouillet, State Superintendent of Public Instruction

RE: Development of Teacher Evaluation Models

RCW 28A.67.225 directs the Superintendent of Public Instruction to report to the Legislature on:

> "The progress of the development and field testing of minimum procedural standards and model evaluation programs on or before January 1, 1987 and January 1, 1988."

This is the second of those reports and contains a draft of the proposed minimum procedural standards for evaluation as well as information regarding the field testing and development of model evaluation programs.

For additional copies of this report or further information please contact:

Judy Hartmann
Administrative Assistant for Governmental Liaison
Old Capitol Building, FG-11
Olympia, WA 98504
(206) 586-6906
SCAN 321-6906

Old Capitol Building, FG-11, Olympia, Washington 98504-3211

REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE ON DEVELOPMENT OF MINIMUM PROCEDURAL STANDARDS FOR EVALUATION OF CERTIFICATED CLASSROOM TEACHERS AND SUPPORT STAFF AND FIELD-TESTING OF MODEL EVALUATION PROGRAMS

(In Response to RCW 28A.67.225)

January 1, 1988

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Report on Legislative Directives and OSPI-Related Activities Pursuant to RCW 28A.67.225 - Minimum Standards for Evaluation 1

- o Legislative Directive 1 1
- o OSPI Action 2
- o Legislative Directive 2 3
- o OSPI Action 3
- o Legislative Directive 3 4
- o OSPI Action 4
- o Legislative Directive 4 5
- o OSPI Action 5

OSPI Recommendations to the Legislature 6

- o Recommendation 1 6
- o Recommendation 2 7

Appendices

Appendix A: Draft of Proposed Minimum Procedural Standards for Evaluation 8
Appendix B: Members of OSPI Advisory Task Force on Evaluation 16
Appendix C: School Districts Selected for Field Testing Model Evaluation Programs and Brief Description of their Pilot Projects 19
Appendix D: Proposed Amendments to RCW 28A.67.225 32
Appendix E: RCW 28A.67.225 Minimum Standards for Evaluations .. 34

Report on Legislative Directives and OSPI-Related Activities Pursuant to RCW 28A.67.225 - Minimum Standards for Evaluations

The following is a list of legislative directives to the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) pursuant to RCW 28A.67.225, and the OSPI actions taken in response to those directives.

Legislative Directive 1

RCW 28A.67.225, Section (1), directs that no later than July 1, 1986, the Superintendent of Public Instruction propose minimum procedural standards for field tests of evaluation programs required by RCW 28A.67.065, Section (1).

The minimum procedural standards for evaluation were to be developed "in consultation with local school directors, administrators, parents, students, the business community, and teachers." In addition, the Legislature directed that minimum procedural standards reflect current research and include:

> "(a) A statement of the purpose of evaluations; (b) the frequency of evaluations, with recognition of the need for more frequent evaluations for beginning teachers; (c) the conduct of the evaluation; (d) the procedure to be used in making the evaluation; and (e) the use of the results of the evaluation."

OSPI Action

The Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction has completed the following actions relative to the above mentioned legislative directive:

1. Proposed minimum procedural standards for evaluation have been developed in accordance with the requirements outlined in RCW 28A.67.225(1). These proposed procedural standards were developed cooperatively by the OSPI staff and members of the OSPI Advisory Task Force on Evaluation. The Advisory Task Force membership represents school directors, administrators, parents, students, the business community and teachers.

2. A review of the research on teacher evaluation processes was conducted by the Center for the Assessment of Administrative Performance (an organization administered jointly by the University of Washington and Washington State University). This study served as a research base for the development of the proposed minimum procedural standards for evaluation prepared by OSPI.

A draft of the proposed minimum procedural standards on evaluation and a listing of the OSPI Advisory Task Force on Evaluation membership are included in Appendices A and B, respectively.

Legislative Directive 2

The Superintendent of Public Instruction was directed to develop or purchase and conduct field tests of model evaluation programs in local districts during 1987-88. The field tests were to include standardized evaluation instruments which met the minimum standards developed by OSPI as well as the minimum criteria set forth in RCW 28A.67.065. The Superintendent of Public Instruction was also directed to compensate any district participating in such tests for the actual expenses incurred by the district.

OSPI Action

1. Field tests of model evaluation programs are currently being conducted in eleven school districts throughout the state. Approximately 1,257 teachers in 66 schools are involved in the eleven districts. The districts conducting these pilot activities were selected on a competitive basis after submitting proposals for grant awards. Planning grants of $5,000 were issued to each of the eleven districts during the 1986-87 school year to develop plans for field testing model evaluation programs during the 1987-88 school year. Several of the model programs being piloted include the use of standardized evaluation instruments as directed in RCW 28A.67.225(2). (See Appendix C for a listing of the 11 school districts involved in the pilot projects and brief descriptions of their model evaluation programs.)

2. Although the law mandates that the field testing of the model evaluation programs occur during the 1987-88 school year, money was not provided during the last legislative session to support this requirement. OSPI was able to provide only small grants of $1,500 to each of the eleven pilot districts to allow them to conduct minimal field testing activities.

Legislative Directive 3

OSPI was directed to consult with school directors, administrators, parents, students, the business community, and teachers in considering:

> "...a variety of programs such as programs providing for peer review, and evaluation input by parents, input by students in appropriate circumstances, instructional assistance teams, and outside professional evaluation. Such programs shall include specific indicators of performance or detailed work expectations against which performance can be measured."

OSPI Action

1. The OSPI Advisory Task Force on Evaluation reviewed and selected the eleven pilot model evaluation programs, giving consideration to the factors specified above; that is (a) peer review, (b) evaluation by parents and students when appropriate, (c) instructional assistance teams, and (d) outside professional evaluators.

2. As directed by RCW 28A.67.225(2), specific indicators of performance and related work expectations are also included as a part of the model evaluation programs being piloted.

Legislative Directive 4

RCW 28A.67.225, Section (3), directs that:

> "Not later than September 1, 1988, the Superintendent of Public Instruction shall adopt state procedural standards and select from one to five model evaluation programs which may be used by local districts in conducting evaluations pursuant to RCW 28A.67.065(1). Local school districts are to establish and implement an evaluation program on or before September 1, 1989, by selecting one of the models approved by the Superintendent of Public Instruction or by adopting an evaluation program pursuant to the bargaining process set forth in Chapters 41.56 and 41.59 RCW. Local school districts may adopt an evaluation program which contains criteria and standards in excess of the minimum criteria and standards established by the Superintendent of Public Instruction."

OSPI Action

Proposed procedural standards are contained in Appendix A. Initially developed by OSPI staff and the Advisory Task Force on Evaluation, these minimum procedural standards will be revised as recommendations for change are received from the field. It is anticipated that the proposed minimum procedural standards will be ready for adoption on schedule, September 1, 1988.

No funding was provided by the legislature for the field testing of the model evaluation programs during the 1987-88 school year. However, the eleven districts that were issued planning grants during the 1986-87 school year are continuing to pilot their model programs as best they can during the current school year. As indicated previously, OSPI is supplementing piloting efforts with $1,500 mini-grants.

OSPI Recommendations to the Legislature

The following recommendations are based upon the need for OSPI to continue to meet the legislative requirements contained in RCW 28A.67.225 - Minimum Standards for Evaluations. (Proposed amendatory language to RCW 28A.67.225, addressing the recommendations listed below, is contained in Appendix D.)

Recommendation 1

Since funding for field testing of pilot evaluation programs during 1987-89 was not provided in the 1987-89 biennial budget, as originally planned, and since OSPI believes such field testing is essential to selection of valid and reliable evaluation programs, OSPI requests that the Legislature:

a. appropriate an additional $200,000 to allow for adequate field testing of the eleven pilot evaluation programs during 1988, and

b. allow OSPI to delay adoption of the procedural standards and selection of from one to five evaluation models for statewide use until September 1, 1989 after such field testing is complete.

Recommendation 2

RCW 28A.67.225 does not make explicit that this law applies to evaluation programs for certificated support personnel as well as certificated teachers. It is, therefore, requested that RCW 28A.67.225(1) be amended to so indicate.

Appendix A

Draft of Proposed Minimum Procedural Standards for Evaluation

APPENDIX A

DRAFT OF PROPOSED MINIMUM PROCEDURAL STANDARDS FOR EVALUATION

Authority. The authority for these standards is RCW 28A.67.225 which authorizes the Superintendent of Public Instruction to develop minimum procedural standards for evaluation of certificated classroom teachers and certificated support personnel conducted pursuant to RCW 28A.67.065.

The minimum procedural standards for evaluation used for developing and testing local district model evaluation programs, including standardized evaluation instruments which meet the minimum procedural standards, shall include the minimum criteria for certificated classroom teachers and certificated support personnel listed in WAC 392-191-010 and WAC 392-191-020. No later than September 1, 1988, the Superintendent of Public Instruction shall adopt from one to five model evaluation programs chosen from among those evaluation programs tested pursuant to the minimum procedural standards.

Purpose and Philosophy Statement. The primary purpose of evaluation shall be to improve teaching skills and encourage professional growth. The minimum procedural standards are intended to focus on a formative evaluation process which is teacher centered, encourages peer sharing and support, includes self-assessment and goal setting which are activities separate from summative review, and provides opportunities for a variety of professional improvement activities.

Development by Local School Districts of an Evaluation Program for Field Testing Purposes--Personnel Required. Each local school district shall include, at a minimum, representatives of the following groups in its development of a program of evaluation which meets the minimum procedural standards for evaluation of certificated classroom teachers and certificated support personnel:

(1) Certificated Classroom Teachers. A minimum of one teacher from the elementary level and one teacher from the secondary level if the local school districts provides education services to any grades beyond sixth grade.

(2) Certificated Support Personnel. A minimum of one itinerant staff person, if the school district employs itinerant personnel, and a minimum of one other representative of counseling, assessment, library and/or other certificated support staff, if the school district employs non-itinerant certificated support staff.

(3) Central Office Administrators. A minimum of one representative.

(4) Building Level Administrators. A minimum of one representative.

Any local school district that has only one school building may include only one administrator on the planning team. The local school district may include other personnel in the development of its evaluation program.

Definition--Minimum Procedural Standards for Evaluation. As used herein the term "minimum standards for evaluation" shall mean the five standards listed in RCW 28A.67.225, (a) a statement of the purpose of evaluations; (b) the frequency of evaluations; (c) the conduct of the evaluations; (d) the procedure to be used in making evaluations and (e) the use of the evaluation results.

Minimum Procedural Standards--Statement of Purpose of Evaluations. The purposes of evaluations of certificated classroom teachers and certificated support personnel shall be, at a minimum:

(1) to provide opportunities for periodic self-assessment by all teachers or support personnel of their job performance;

(2) to provide periodic opportunities for supervisors to observe the professional performance of teachers and support personnel and to communicate with the teachers and support personnel about observed performance;

(3) to identify in consultation with teachers and support personnel observed, if appropriate, particular areas in which their professional performance is satisfactory or outstanding, and particular areas in which the teacher or support person might improve his/her performance;

(4) to assist teachers and support personnel, who have identified areas needing improvement, in making those improvements.

Minimum Procedural Standard--Frequency of Evaluation. Certificated classroom teachers and certificated support personnel shall be annually evaluated in the performance of their assigned duties, pursuant to RCW 28A.67.065.

Minimum Procedural Standard--Conduct of the Evaluation.

(1)(a) Summative evaluation of certificated classroom teachers and certificated support personnel shall include, at a minimum, observation and oral and written comment pursuant to RCW 28A.67.065(1) by:

(1) the principal or his/her designee at the school to which the certificated employee is assigned, or

(2) the immediate supervisor of the certificated employee.

Such evaluation ((~~shall~~)) may also include written and oral comment by the certificated employee being evaluated. This aspect of the evaluation shall constitute the formal, summative portion of the evaluation which shall be made a part of the employee's personnel file.

(b) For formative evaluation, the certificated employee shall complete an annual self-assessment, including setting of individual professional goals and outlining a plan for accomplishing them. The employee may include in the formative process, observation and comment by one or more peers of the certificated employee's choice, comment by students, and comment by parents of students instructed by the certificated employee. Any employee electing to utilize student or parent comments in the formative process shall prepare and submit to the employee's principal or

immediate supervisor a written plan identifying the procedures to be used in soliciting such comments. The plan shall be submit to the approval of the principal or supervisor prior to its implementation, which approval shall shall not be unreasonably withheld. Comments and other documentation produced in the formative process, at the employee's election, may be made available to the employee's principal or immediate supervisor but ((~~Such observation and comments~~)) shall not be included as a part of the certificated employee's permanent evaluation records. In no event shall the comments or other documentation produced in the formative process be admissable as evidence, either for or against an employee, in any hearing conducted pursuant to RCW 28A.58.455. ((~~except at the certificated employee's request. No penalty or adverse action shall follow from the decision of a certificated employee to exclude from the employee's permanent evaluation file evaluation comments from peers, students or teachers.~~))

(2) (a) The evaluation instrument used in summative evaluation shall include, as a minimum for certificated classroom teachers, the minimum criteria set forth in WAC 392-191-010; and for certificated support personnel the minimum criteria set forth in WAC 392-191-020. Nothing in this chapter shall be construed to prohibit a local school district from developing an evaluation instrument which contains criteria in excess of those established by the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

(b) The performance of the employee, using the criteria in WAC 392-191-010 or WAC 392-191-020 shall be rated either satisfactory or

unsatisfactory, provided that, a district may develop indicators of performance in excess of the two established herein as a part of its evaluation program.

Minimum Procedural Standard--Procedure to be Used in Making Evaluations.

(1) The procedures stipulated in RCW 28A.67.065 shall be used by principals and other supervisory personnel conducting summative evaluations of certificated classroom teachers and certificated support personnel.

(2) Each employee shall have the opportunity for a minimum of two confidential conferences with his/her principal or other evaluator either following receipt of the written summative and formative evaluation results, or at a time mutually satisfactory to the participants. The purpose of such conference shall be to discuss either or both the summative and formative evaluations with the employee, and provide guidance, assistance, and encouragement to the employee to aid in improving his/her performance, if appropriate.

((~~(3) If the employee requests that review and comments by peers, students, or parents of students the employee instructs be included as part of the written, permanent summative evaluation, it shall be done at the sole discretion of the employee.~~))

Minimum Procedural Standard--Use of Evaluation Results. (1) Summative evaluation results shall be used:

(a) to document the satisfactory performance by an employee of his/her assigned duties;

(b) to identify discrete areas according to the criteria included on the evaluation instrument in which the employee may need improvement;

(c) to document performance by an employee judged unsatisfactory based on the district evaluation criteria.

(2) The district may use the evaluation results to identify certificated classroom teachers and certificated support personnel whose performance is meritorious, if such use has been adopted as part of its policy describing the conduct and procedure of its model evaluation program. If under (1)(b) and (c) the evaluator identifies a discrete area(a) in which the employee needs improvement, the local school district shall provide appropriate ((~~inservice~~)) opportunities for that employee to aid him/her in efforts toward improvement.

(3) Formative evaluation shall be used:

(a) to encourage employee self-assessment and goal setting;

(b) to provide opportunities for and encourage sharing among teaching and support staff of personal professional experience and expertise;

(c) To aid employees in planning personal professional growth plans;

(d) To provide opportunities for parents, students, and other interested community members to offer meaningful input to their schools through their observations of instructional effectiveness;

(e) to link identified professional needs with appropriate inservice, staff development, and other appropriate professional growth and instructional improvement opportunities.

All written materials generated for or resulting from the formative evaluation process hall be kept separate from the summative permanent records((, ~~except that the employee may, at his/her discretion, request that his/her self-assessment, goals and plan and/or comments from peers, students and parents be included in his/her permanent records. Such~~)) <u>All</u> materials <u>produced in the formative evaluation process</u> shall be confidential and shall be shared only with persons identified by the employee as having access to them.

Appendix B

Members of OSPI Advisory Task Force on Evaluation

APPENDIX B

TASK FORCE ON EVALUATION

WASHINGTON EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

Gail Mathison, 8168 E. Cricket Lane, Port Orchard 98366

Melanie Mitchell, 907 S. Naches Avenue, Yakima 98901

Peter Bogdanoff, 4212 Eastern Avenue, Seattle 98103

Staff: Jim Russell, P.O. Box 460, Poulsbo 98370

WASHINGTON FEDERATION OF TEACHERS

Leon Traynor, 1101 So. Yakima, Tacoma 98405

Staff: Barbara Otterson, WFT, 2366 Eastlake Ave. E., Seattle 98102

WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

Jim Parsley, Superintendent, Vancouver S.D., 605 N. Devine Road, Vancouver 98661

Staff: Howard Coble, WASA, 521 E. Union, Olympia 98501

WASHINGTON STATE SCHOOL DIRECTORS ASSOCIATION

Gail Pierson, 3516 South 336th, Auburn, WA 98002

Staff: Dwayne Slate, WSSDA, 200 E. Union, Olympia 98501

ASSOCIATION OF WASHINGTON SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

Merlyn Simmons, 1841 No. 177th, Seattle 98133

Staff: Dick Stimson, AWSP, 1021 E. 8th, Olympia 98501

WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION of SCHOOL PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATORS

Steve Schmitz, 309 Pinetree Court, Richland, WA 99352

Staff: George Murdock, WASPA, Walla Walla S.D., 364 So. Park, Walla Walla 99362

CITIZEN'S EDUCATION CENTER NORTHWEST

Jan Stout, 9632 Hilltop Road, Bellevue 98004

Staff: Catherine Watters, CECN, 105 S. Main Street, Suite 327, Seattle 98104

WASHINGTON ROUNDTABLE

Neal Supplee, 2014 NE 104th, Seattle 98125

Staff: Martha Darling, Executive Director, Washington Roundtable, M.S. 7E-21, 3101 NE Northup Way, Bellevue 98004

WASHINGTON STATE PTA

Kay Nelson, 3624 Waldrick Road SE, Olympia 98501

Staff: James Carpenter, Executive Director, Washington State Parent Teachers Association, 601 Tacoma Avenue So., Tacoma 98402

Appendix C

School Districts Selected for Field Testing Model Evaluation Programs and Brief Descriptions of their Pilot Projects

APPENDIX C

SCHOOL DISTRICTS SELECTED BY OSPI TO DEVELOP AND FIELD TEST MODEL EVALUATION PROGRAMS

DISTRICTS SELECTED FOR FUNDING*	DISTRICT ENROLLMENT	ESD	TYPE OF EVALUATION MODEL
South Kitsap	9,000	114	Locally-developed Model
Warden	630	171	Locally-developed Model
North Thurston	8,849	113	Locally-developed Model
Wenatchee	4,630	171	Locally-developed Model
Prosser	1,980	123	Florida Model/ITIP
Arlington	2,790	189	Florida, UWTAS, Indicators of Quality
Kent	17,606	121	"Kent Blended Model"
Snohomish	6,000	189	Locally-developed Model
Camas	2,150	112	Teacher Evaluation - Five Keys to Growth
Riverview	1,553	121	Locally-developed Model
Adna	430	113	ITIP and TESA blend

ESD	# OF PROPOSALS SELECTED
121	(2)
123	(1)
114	(1)
113	(2)
171	(2)
112	(1)
101	(0)
105	(0)
189	(2)

*Each district was issued a planning grant of up to a maximum of $5,000 during 1986-87 school year.

Model Evaluation Projects

Eleven school districts are now field-testing model evaluation programs. Approximately 1,257 teachers and 23,021 students are participating in this program in 36 elementary schools, 17 middle-junior high schools, and 13 senior high schools.

Special features of the models include:

- An emphasis on professional development (formative evaluation vs. summative evaluation)
- Peer coaching
- Self assessment
- Individualized goal setting as a basis for evaluation

Several of the districts have incorporated evaluation strategies already in use, such as:

- Instructional Theory Into Practice (ITIP)
- Florida Performance Measurement System (FPMS)
- University of Washington Teacher Asssessment System (UWTAS)
- Teacher Effectiveness and Student Achievement (TESA)
- Five Keys to Growth (FKTG)

More detailed descriptions of each model follow.

1. Kent

District Information:

Contact Person: Ms. Mary Ann Kendall, Assistant Superintendent

Number of certificated staff involved in the pilot program: 20

Number of students involved: 2,500

Grades Served: K-12

Number of buildings involved:

Elementary:	4
Middle/Junior High:	3
High School:	2

Brief Description of Pilot Project:

Called the "Kent Blended Model," this pilot evaluation system integrates existing observation and feedback models. This is a voluntary program which focuses on the peer coaching concept and characteristics derived from three different staff development/ assessment systems: UWTAS (University of Washington Teacher Assessment System); ITIP (Instructional Theory Into Practice); and TESA (Teacher Effectiveness and Student Achievement). The formative evaluation system will be developed separately from the summative system.

2. Wenatchee

District Information:

Contact Person: Ms. Rita Clark, Assistant Superintendent

Number of certificated staff involved in the pilot program: 270

Number of students involved: 5,211

Grades Served: K-12

Number of buildings involved:

Elementary: 6

Middle/Junior High: 2

High School: 1

Brief Description of Pilot Project:

The following process is used in this model evaluation program:

1) The teacher establishes professional goals.

2) The teacher and supervisor meet for a pre-observation conference.

3) The supervisor observes and prepares and observation summary.

4) The supervisor and teacher meet for a post-observation conference.

5) The supervisor prepares a final evaluation.

Professional Goals would include: teaching strategy goals, curriculum goals, and evaluation indicators.

Pre-Observation Conference might include: lesson objectives, teaching techniques and strategies to be used; indicators of achievement, and teaching behaviors that will be monitored.

Observation Summary might include such characteristics as: procedures, objectives, delivery, interaction, behavior management, praise, on-task behavior, guided practice, and assessment.

Post-Observation Conference would include: identifying things that went well; causes of things that went well; what might be done differently; what is a desirable focus for next lesson; kinds of assistance that might be provided by observer or evaluator.

Final Evaluation report would be based upon pre-established criteria and indicators of performance.

3. South Kitsap

District Information:

Contact Person: Dr. Dewayne Gower, Superintendent

Number of certificated staff involved in the pilot program: 200

Number of students involved: 3,500

Grades Served: K-12
Special Education, Itinerant Staff

Number of buildings involved:

Elementary: 9

Middle/Junior High: 3

High School: 1

Brief Description of Pilot Project:

The South Kitsap pilot evaluation model focuses on a goal setting process: teacher goals; student goals; program goals; and organizational goals. Peer coaching and communicating skills are also being emphasized during the development of the pilot program.

Peer involvement is encouraged. Teachers may elect to use colleagues in observations, data collecting or as collaborators. Teachers may choose to work in teams, department groups or grade levels. The supervisor acts as a coach, observer, facilitator and/or data collector.

The summative and formative evaluation systems will be kept separate. Only experienced teachers who themselves have been evaluated as "successful" for four or more years will be eligible to participate as mentors.

4. Warden

District Information:

Contact Person: Mr. Jack O'Brien, Principal, Jeanette Evans Elementary School

Number of certificated staff involved in the pilot program: 37

Number of students involved: 675

Grades Served: K-12

Number of buildings involved:

Elementary: 1

Middle/Junior High: 1

High School: 1

Brief Description of Pilot Project:

There are two types of evaluation being developed in the pilot program. Each certificated staff member participating in the pilot project will be involved in an evaluation by the principal (or his/her designee), and peer(s), as well as self-assessment. The process for such evaluations follows:

A. Administrative Evaluation

1) Pre-Observation Conference

2) Observation/Data Collected

3) Post-Observation Conference

4) Periodic, Unscheduled Observations

B. Peer/Self-Evaluation

1) Individual Improvement Goals

2) Peer Observation

3) Self-Evaluation

5. Riverview

District Information:

Contact Person: Dr. Karen Forys, Superintendent

Number of certificated staff involved in the pilot program: 12-15

Number of students involved: 585

Grades Served: K-12

Number of buildings involved:

Elementary: 2

Middle/Junior High: 1

High School: 1

Brief Description of Pilot Project:

The Professional Growth Opportunity Model is a multiple-option model designed to assist educators in making choices about professional growth. Four specific options are provided: expertise option, problem-solving option, study option and school visitation option. Each educator can select the option that most adequately meets his or her current needs. In addition, the educator can choose one of three processes to fulfill this option: studying alone, working with a mentor or collaborating with a colleague. The emphasis is on professional growth through an individually chosen and individually designed program.

6. Adna

District Information:

Contact Person: Mr. Eugene Pyles, Superintendent

Number of certificated staff involved in the pilot program: 30

Number of students involved: 500

Grades Served: K-12

Number of buildings involved:

Elementary: 1

Middle/Junior High: 1

High School: 1

Brief Description of Pilot Project:

This pilot evaluation model is centered around the teacher's professional growth plan involving a wide range of individualized goals and activities designed to achieve those goals. Suggested goal areas, activities to achieve those goals, and possible assessment/feedback options include the following:

Suggested Goal Areas	Suggested Activities Options	Suggested Assessment/ Feedback Options
Effective Teaching Strategies	Visitation to other classes and/or schools	Peer Coaching/ Observation
Curriculum (Program)	Inservice/workshops	Video recording lessons
Teacher Effectiveness and Student Achievement (TESA)	Professional reading	Audio recording lessons
Instructional Theory Into Practice (ITIP)	College classes	Self-rating/evaluation
Peer Coaching	Viewing of professional video/films	Student evaluation
Classroom Climate	Use of new supplies/ equipment	Parent or community evaluation
Higher Order Thinking	Research	Principal/Supervisor
Review of research (in a particular area)	Developing proposals for grant awards	Standardized test results

7. Prosser

District Information:

Contact Person: Dr. Loyd Waite, Superintendent

Number of certificated staff involved in the pilot program: 15

Number of students involved: 350

Grades Served: K-12

Number of buildings involved:

Elementary: 2

Middle/Junior High: 1

High School: 1

Brief Description of Pilot Project:

1) An 18 member Instructional Model/Evaluation Committee (IMEC) serving as an advisory task force.

2) The objective is to develop a clinical supervision/ evaluation model.

3) Elementary teachers decided upon ITIP to serve as a basis for pilot program, while secondary level teachers selected the FPMS (Florida Performance Measurement System) as a basis for the pilot model.

4) The system is to include both summative and formative components.

5) Teachers will share their own formative plans with principals.

8. Camas

District Information:

Contact Person: Dr. Richard Mariotti, Superintendent

Number of certificated staff involved in the pilot program: 30

Number of students involved: 1,300

Grades Served: K-12

Number of buildings involved:

Elementary: 2

Middle/Junior High: 1

High School: 1

Brief Description of Pilot Project:

The pilot evaluation model is patterned after material presented in Dan Duke's book on teacher evaluation entitled Five Keys to Growth. Focus of the pilot program is on:

1) Induction - using mentor teachers and peer coaching.

2) Professional Accountability - emphasizing risk-taking and improved data collection techniques.

3) Professional Growth - teachers setting their own goals and plans for implementing those goals.

Five teachers from each building are involved in the pilot program. The pilot evaluation model is being implemented outside the negotiated agreement. The summative evaluation system will remain in place during development of the formative model.

9. Snohomish

District Information:

Contact Person: Mr. Carroll Brown, Assistant Personnel Director

Number of certificated staff involved in the pilot program: 60

Number of students involved: 2,400

Grades Served: K-12

Number of buildings involved:

Elementary: 1

Middle/Junior High: 1

High School: 1

Brief Description of Pilot Project:

The pilot evaluation model being developed by the Snohomish School District focuses on a formative evaluation process involving goal setting and self-assessment. Support personnel called "Instructional Support Teachers" and peer coaching are also main components of the pilot evaluation program being developed.

The summative evaluation system is separate from the formative evaluation process and focuses primarily on the teaching act.

10. Arlington

District Information:

Contact Person: Dr. Michael Jarboee, Assistant Superintendent

Number of certificated staff involved in the pilot program: 275

Number of students involved: 2,500

Grades Served: K-12

Number of buildings involved:

Elementary: 2

Middle/Junior High: 1

High School: 1

Brief Description of Pilot Project:

The main emphasis of Arlington's pilot evaluation model is on the identification of quality instruction and the "indicators of quality." The district has already been working with the Florida Performance Measurement System and is reviewing other evaluation/staff development systems such as UWTAS, TESA, and ITIP in an effort to synthesize common indicators of quality instruction. A team has also been assigned to review research on teacher effectiveness. Observation instruments will be developed, based upon the results of the research review and final selection of "indicators of quality instruction." Staff will be trained in using whatever system is ultimately designed. It has already been determined that peer coaching teams will be an integral part of the formative evaluation system.

The formative and summative evaluation systems will be kept separate.

11. North Thurston

District Information:

Contact Person: Ms. Debbie Wing, Administrative Assistant/ Personnel and Planning

Number of certificated staff involved in the pilot program: All staff will have the opportunity to provide input in the development. We plan to initially involve one-third of the staff in the formative plan (approximately 175 FTE).

Number of students involved: 3,500

Grades Served: K-12

Number of buildings involved:

Elementary:	10
Middle/Junior High:	2
High School:	2

Brief Description of Pilot Project:

The model evaluation system is being developed by piloting it in 14 different schools within the district. Much work has gone into building ownership in the formative system which is being developed by making presentations to the School Board, the Superintendent, Principals and the local education associations. District task force has reviewed evaluation and teacher effectiveness literature in addition to taking a close look at some successful evaluation systems currently being implemented in the state.

Goal setting will be a key element of the pilot program and the characteristics of quality circles, an industrial model, are being reviewed to determine their applicability to the school setting and the improvement of instruction.

Appendix D

Proposed Amendments to RCW 28A.67.225

APPENDIX D

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO RCW 28A.67.225

(1) The Superintendent of Public Instruction shall develop for field-test purposes, and in consultation with local school directors, administrators, parents, students, the business community, and teachers, minimum procedural standards for evaluations of certificated classroom teachers and certificated support personnel ((~~conducted pursuant to RCW 28A.67.065(1)~~)). The minimum procedural standards for evaluation shall be based on available research and shall include: (a) a statement of the purpose of evaluations; (b) the frequency of evaluations, with recognition of the need for more frequent evaluations for beginning teachers; (c) the conduct of the evaluation; (d) the procedure to be used in making the evaluations; and (e) the use of the results of the evaluation.

The Superintendent of Public Instruction shall propose the minimum procedural standards for field tests not later than July 1, 1986.

(2) The Superintendent of Public Instruction shall develop or purchase and conduct field tests in local districts during the 1987-88 and 1988-89 school years model evaluation programs, including standardized evaluation instruments which meet the minimum standards developed pursuant to subsection (1) of this section and the minimum criteria established pursuant to RCW 28A.67.065. In consultation with school directors, administrators, parents, students, the business community, and teachers, the superintendent of public instruction shall consider a variety of programs such as programs providing for peer review and evaluation input by

parents, input by students in appropriate circumstances, instructional assistance teams, and outside professional evaluation. Such programs shall include specific indicators of performance or detailed work expectations against which performance can be measured. The Superintendent of Public Instruction shall compensate any district participating in such tests for the actual expenses incurred by the district.

(3) Not later than September 1, ((~~1988~~)) 198°, the Superintendent of Public Instruction shall adopt state procedural standards and select from one to five model evaluation programs which may be used by local districts in conducting evaluations pursuant to RCW 28A.67.065(1). Local school districts shall establish and implement an evaluation program on or before September 1, ((~~1989~~)) 1990, by selecting one of the models approved by the Superintendent of Public Instruction or by adopting an evaluation program pursuant to the bargaining process set forth in chapters 41.56 and 41.59 RCW. Local school districts may adopt an evaluation program which contains criteria and standards in excess of the minimum criteria and standards established by the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

(4) The Superintendent of Public Instruction shall report to the legislature on the progress of the development and field testing of minimum procedural standards and model evaluation programs on or before January 1, 1987, ((~~and~~)) January 1, 1988, and January 1, 198°.

Appendix E

RCW 28A.67.225 Minimum Standards for Evaluations

RCW 28A.67.225 Minimum standards for evaluations——Superintendent of public instruction to develop minimum procedural standards and programs——Establishment and implementation of programs——Reports. (1) The superintendent of public instruction shall develop for field-test purposes, and in consultation with local school directors, administrators, parents, students, the business community, and teachers, minimum procedural standards for evaluations conducted pursuant to RCW 28A.67.065(1). The minimum procedural standards for evaluation shall be based on available research and shall include: (a) A statement of the purpose of evaluations; (b) the frequency of evaluations, with recognition of the need for more frequent evaluations for beginning teachers; (c) the conduct of the evaluation; (d) the procedure to be used in making the evaluation; and (e) the use of the results of the evaluation.

The superintendent of public instruction shall propose the minimum procedural standards for field tests not later than July 1, 1986.

(2) The superintendent of public instruction shall develop or purchase and conduct field tests in local districts during the 1987-88 school year model evaluation programs, including standardized evaluation instruments, which meet the minimum standards developed pursuant to subsection (1) of this section and the minimum criteria established pursuant to RCW 28A.67.065. In consultation with school directors, administrators, parents, students, the business community, and teachers, the superintendent of public instruction shall consider a variety of programs such as programs providing for peer review and evaluation input by parents, input by students in appropriate circumstances, instructional assistance teams, and outside professional evaluation. Such programs shall include specific indicators of performance or detailed work expectations against which performance can be measured. The superintendent of public instruction shall compensate any district participating in such tests for the actual expenses incurred by the district.

(3) Not later than September 1, 1988, the superintendent of public instruction shall adopt state procedural standards and select from one to five model evaluation programs which may be used by local districts in conducting evaluations pursuant to RCW 28A.67.065(1). Local school districts shall establish and implement an evaluation program on or before September 1, 1989, by selecting one of the models approved by the superintendent of public instruction or by adopting an evaluation program pursuant to the bargaining process set forth in chapters 41.56 and 41.59 RCW. Local school districts may adopt an evaluation program which contains criteria and standards in excess of the minimum criteria and standards established by the superintendent of public instruction.

(4) The superintendent of public instruction shall report to the legislature on the progress of the development and field testing of minimum procedural standards and model evaluation programs on or before January 1, 1987, and January 1, 1988. [1986 c 73 § 1; 1985 c 420 § 7.]